UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

Case No. 15-CR-111-WMC

ROBERT SHILTS,

Madison, Wisconsin April 27, 2017

3:30 p.m.

Defendant.

STENOGRAPHIC TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING HEARING HELD BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM M. CONLEY,

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:

Office of the United States Attorney BY: ELIZABETH ALTMAN

Assistant United States Attorney

660 West Washington Avenue Madison, Wisconsin 53703

For the Defendant:

Federal Defender Services of Wisconsin

Madison Branch Office BY: JOSEPH BUGNI

22 East Mifflin Street, Ste. 1000

Madison, Wisconsin 53703

Also appearing:

Robert Shilts - defendant Catherine Cwirla - US Probation Officer

Lynette Swenson RMR, CRR, CRC
U.S. District Court Federal Reporter
United States District Court
120 North Henry Street, Rm. 410
Madison, Wisconsin 53703

(Proceedings called to order.)

THE CLERK: Case No. 15-CR-111. The United

States of America v. Robert Shilts called for sentencing.

May we have the appearances, please.

MS. ALTMAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. The United States appears by Elizabeth Altman.

MR. BUGNI: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Joe
Bugni from Federal Defender Services appearing on behalf
of Mr. Shilts.

THE COURT: Very good. We are here for the sentencing of Robert Shilts. And my first obligation, Mr. Shilts, is just to confirm that you've read and discussed the presentence report, the revised report, and the addendum with your counsel. So have you had time to review those things with your counsel?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. The government is moving for a one-level additional reduction, I assume?

MS. ALTMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And I will note because I received such a detailed submission by the Federal Defender's Office in this case making a number of policy arguments, both general and specific, and also factual arguments, both general and specific to this defendant, that if the government wanted to submit a written response, I would

give you time to do that before I sentence.

MS. ALTMAN: I don't think that's necessary,

Your Honor. I'll just address them verbally. But thank
you for the opportunity.

THE COURT: All right. I will then accept the plea agreement, finding that the offense of conviction adequately reflects the defendant's criminal conduct. The plea agreement does not undermine the statutory purposes of sentencing.

In determining the defendant's sentence, I will take 11 into consideration the advisory sentencing guidelines as well as the statutory purposes of sentencing that are set forth in Sec. 3553(a). It is those statutory purposes that control my sentence.

I note that neither party objected to the presentence report, although the defendant provided additional information which was included in the revised presentence report and now raises a valid concern with respect to enhancement for use of a computer in Sec. 2G2.2, which I will address.

Subject to that caveat, I find the probation office 22

has calculated the advisory guidelines correctly using the current manual and taking into account all relevant conduct under Sec. 1B1.3. The guideline for possession of child pornography in violation of Sec. 2252(a)(4)(B)

is found in Title 18 -- I'm sorry, of Title 18 is found in Sec. 2G2.2. The base offense level is 18 under subsection 2(a)(1). A two-level increase is applied under subsection 2(b)(2) because the defendant possessed images that depicted sexually explicit conduct involving prepubescent minors. No more levels are added under subsection 2(b)(3)(F) because the defendant knowingly engaged in distribution of those images. An additional four levels are added under subsection (b)(4)(B) because the images involved the sexual abuse or exploitation of an infant and toddler.

Finally, as I already alluded to, under Sec.

2G2.2(b)(6), two levels are added because the offense involved the use of a computer or interactive computer service for receipt of the material.

As to this provision, I find the two-level increase has not been adequately considered by the U.S. Sentencing Commission. If anything, as time wears on, the specific increase is becoming more and more or is becoming less or less relevant because most received possession and distribution of child pornography involves the use of a computer or interactive computer services at this point. Under Sec. 5K2.0, I will grant a two-level downward departure in light of that fact.

This results in a total offense level of 23. Since

no other Chapter 2 adjustments apply, the defendant qualifies for a three-level downward adjustment under Sec. 3E1.1 because he has demonstrated acceptance of responsibility for his offense. The government has moved for the additional reduction.

With a total offense level of 20 and a criminal history category of I, the defendant has an advisory guideline imprisonment range of 46 to 57 months. And that's where I will begin to consider an appropriate sentence in this case. And I will hear first from the government as to what that sentence should be.

MS. ALTMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. And before I begin with that, I would like to inform the Court that we have come to an agreement on the restitution amount.

THE COURT: I appreciate your mentioning that.

And what is the amount that you --

MS. ALTMAN: It is \$500.

THE COURT: All right. Which seems appropriate given the defendant's financial status.

MS. ALTMAN: And I would also note that there was only one image.

THE COURT: Understood.

MS. ALTMAN: So then with regard to sentencing,

Your Honor, as I indicated I am basically -- my argument
is going to be responding to things in the brief that the

defendant filed. There absolutely is no doubt that this defendant has both physical and mental challenges. I don't think anybody disputes that. And the sentencing brief cites the evaluator's note that it ultimately unable to provide a response, even after pausing for over four minutes.

The report also indicated that when he was speaking to his family, his responses occurred without significant pause and that they were clear and logical. He was also able to get a driver's license. He was also able to engage and chat with the undercover agent. So we know that he is able to learn. We know he is able to function when he's doing things that he either has an interest in or are more familiar to him.

THE COURT: And it's hard to know which it is.

The more familiar clearly is part of this.

MS. ALTMAN: Absolutely. But he was also able to learn enough to pass a driver's test.

THE COURT: Right, right.

MS. ALTMAN: With regard to the activity with the family member that's discussed on page four, there's two separate incidents with the family member. The first are the incidents that's described in the chats to the officer that would have occurred when the defendant was approximately 15 years old. And the sentencing memo

indicates that it's because his intellectual was far beneath a normal 15-year-old, it's unlikely that this happened --

THE COURT: What paragraph are you reading this from?

MS. ALTMAN: It's page four, it's the third paragraph.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. ALTMAN: The problem with this conclusion is that the psychiatric report, which attached the psychosexual report, indicates that this defendant was already involved in inappropriate sexual contact at age 11 or conduct at age 11; that he perhaps --

THE COURT: Yes, I know what you're referring to.

MS. ALTMAN: And yeah, with another child and also pretending to masturbate. That's the first part of the contact with the family member. The second part isn't really addressed at all other than to simply deny it. But if you look at the presentence report in paragraphs 37 and 38, the family member was interviewed in a forensic interview and gave interesting statements: The first one being she was afraid to say anything because she didn't think her family would believe her, and sure enough, that's exactly what happened. She

reported some contact and they said oh, no. He would never do that. That must have been a dream. But the details were so specific: That her shorts were pulled over to one side; the TV was off; and notably the family put a lock on the door the next day. So while they're trying to convince her it didn't happen, it appears that they're less sure about that than their denials would indicate.

With regard to -- and this is the last argument I will make. I'm not going to address the guidelines. The Court is aware of the guidelines as Mr. Bugni states in here. These aren't new conclusions. There is a decision by the Second Circuit that says that you can't rely on the guidelines. I know that argument has been made before. The use of the computer is one that we see all the time. In possession cases though, the other enhancements that this defendant is getting aren't really standard. We have --

THE COURT: And I have included all of those.

MS. ALTMAN: So that's my comment with regard to the guideline policy.

The final thing I would note, and this is on page eight and it's the very bottom of the page, indicating that due to his diminished capacity, "by definition they have diminished capacity to understand and process

information, to communicate, to abstract from mistakes, and to learn from experience, to engage in logical reasoning and to control impulses." Controlling impulses is where we have the problem here. The defendant did say, it's included in paragraph 47, that if he had the guts, he would probably touch the family member. And then combine that with someone who has diminished capacity to control his impulses and we have someone who is a danger. I would, therefore, request the Court sentence him accordingly.

THE COURT: Thank you, Counsel. Mr. Bugni.

MR. BUGNI: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I have read with some care your submission, which was very well crafted and persuasive in a number of respects. I guess I don't share your confidence to the possibility of the specific conduct alleged, the hands-on conduct or reported as it being a child fantasy, particularly given undisputed other conduct when he was a child and the graphic descriptions, which clearly exceeded what any actual contact that may have taken place. But nevertheless shows tremendous preoccupation. If either one of those weren't true, I might share your view that I shouldn't give it any weight. But I have both preoccupation -- severe preoccupation, and a child who really had no reason to

raise it, who raised it initially outside of any concern with regard to the defendant among the family members.

And the combination of the two makes it very difficult for me not to weigh that as part of the risk that the defendant presents.

MR. BUGNI: I don't discount that. Believe me, I struggled with it and I was very careful with my words and what I thought --

THE COURT: Again, I was -- I thought the submission was wonderful and I hope Mr. Shilts appreciates how hard you've worked on his behalf.

MR. BUGNI: I would add that even if you take as true -- it's very difficult because you're in a federal court. You're punishing for another crime. Is there --

THE COURT: It's not -- so we're clear, I'm not punishing for another crime, I'm trying to decide what is appropriate under all the circumstances and part of what I am to consider under the statutory purposes are what kind of a danger the defendant presents.

MR. BUGNI: And I think that damager can be 21 remedied. I mean there's going to be an eventual release, and that remedy has to be with supervision, with, you know, you have to follow the rules, you can't be around young kids, you can't live in that house.

THE COURT: Well, and in fairness, that's also

not having a good solution at the moment, which you pointed out --

MR. BUGNI: Yes.

THE COURT: -- is also a concern to the Court.

But the counterweight to that is, and you did a

tremendous job of laying them out, is that hopefully

there will be very limited opportunity and that the

consensus by all of the experts seems to be that he is a

low, at worst a moderate risk of any sort of reoffending

in that category. So I am -- I am trying to weigh all of

this, but I'm just, I guess, not as confident as your

submission might suggest I should be.

MR. BUGNI: I think even though that not complete confidence in what I have offered, it's whether it's sufficient but not greater than necessary. There can never be those full assurances that we'd all want that this would never happen. But part of it, we never asked for bond in this case after these allegations. We had a bond hearing and then I withdrew it. But we want him away from the niece and we're trying to put together that plan. That plan will have to be put together some time. If this court were to sentence him to prison, it's going to have to be a little bit down the road. But if the major concern is how do we protect society, I think we protect society through supervision. That's really

3

5

6

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

what supervision is there for. That's why I asked for such a lengthy term. And that's why we really have worked hard to put him in a group home and to put -you know, kind of get those strictures in place where not going to be around juveniles; where he's not going be around minors. And if it's true, if it's not true, it doesn't matter, we've ameliorated whatever risk there could be. And I think that's what it comes down to, like, what are we trying to punish here. Because the traditional goals of punishment aren't always going to be as effective on Mr. Schultz or Shilts. Instead, it really becomes protecting the public and think you can protect the public with supervision. perfect? No, but there can never be perfection in that. But we offer a very good solution with the halfway house and giving him the opportunity to get into a group home and have that.

So Your Honor, I don't think there's anything else I can add to those points. I hope that I've alleviated whatever lingering concerns you have. If there was a perfect answer, I'd give it, but I don't believe there is. But I just hope that what I've given is good enough to let Mr. Shilts go to the halfway house and then from there be able to reintegrate into society.

THE COURT: I'm not sure there is even a halfway

```
house that I could send him to today, but I understand
   your general point that you think that's where he should
 3
   be.
        Mr. Shilts, I am interested in hearing from you
   today. First, anything that you'd like to tell me at
   this time before I render sentence.
 6
            THE DEFENDANT: I am really sorry for what I
 8
   did.
 9
   THE COURT:
                        You've been incarcerated now --
10
   you've been at a jail for a year-and-a-half?
            THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.
11
   THE COURT:
                       Mostly in Sauk County; is that
12
13
   right?
14
            THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
            THE COURT: All right. And generally you've
15
   managed reasonably well it sounds like. I know it hasn't
16
17
   been fun, but you've at least had some structure and
   you're taking care of yourself it sounds like. How would
18
19
   you describe it?
20
        (Pause)
21
   THE DEFENDANT: In what way? How would you want
22
   me to describe it?
23
            THE COURT: What would you say about it?
24
        (Pause)
25
            THE COURT: Mr. Bugni, maybe you can assist
```

```
because it's hard to know how much is processing and how
   much is -- and I don't know if it's the -- if it's just
   processing the permutations of what he could say or if
    it's that he doesn't really have words. I just don't --
    so if you could help me somewhat, I would appreciate it.
             MR. BUGNI: Sure. Do you mind if I just ask him
   a couple questions kind of --
             THE COURT:
                         Sure.
             MR. BUGNI: Shiltsy, what do you like to do in
10
    the jail?
             THE DEFENDANT: I like to read books and put
11
12
   puzzles together.
13
             MR. BUGNI: And what about -- is there anything
    else? What about anything that I send you?
14
15
              THE DEFENDANT: I like to do word search
16
   puzzles.
17
             MR. BUGNI: And do you have any friends at Sauk?
              THE DEFENDANT:
18
                             Yes.
19
             MR. BUGNI: And what was the nickname they gave
20
    you?
21
              THE DEFENDANT: My nickname is Mud Truck.
             MR. BUGNI: And how are the guards? Do they
22
23
    treat you okay?
                             Guards treat me pretty good.
24
              THE DEFENDANT:
25
             MR. BUGNI: And what's your favorite meal there?
```

```
THE DEFENDANT: I would have to say the rice
   dishes.
            THE COURT: Anything that you dislike?
        (Pause)
            MR. BUGNI: Can I ask you something?
            THE COURT: You're doing fine.
            MR. BUGNI: Would you like to -- do you
 8
   sometimes where leg braces? Are you supposed to wear leg
 9
   braces?
10
           THE DEFENDANT: Supposed to.
   MR. BUGNI: Would you like to be able to have
11
   those back?
12
13
           THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
   MR. BUGNI: And what about do you like it when
14
15
   they -- the guys don't let you watch NASCAR?
16
            THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
   MR. BUGNI: You like it when you can watch
17
   NASCAR, but what about when they won't put it on?
18
            THE DEFENDANT: I don't like that.
19
20
            THE COURT: How is your back?
            THE DEFENDANT: It hurts every so often.
21
   THE COURT: Yeah. Are you getting your
22
   medications?
23
24
           THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
25
           THE COURT: And does that help?
```

THE DEFENDANT: THE COURT: Just the pain is there. THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: You apologized here today. You said you were sorry. What do you apologize for? 6 THE DEFENDANT: For everything that I did and said on the Kik app. 8 THE COURT: You understand that stopping looking 9 at the images and talking to people about it is part of 10 what you have to learn to do. Do you understand that? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: That might be the hardest thing 12 about this sentence, but you will be back in front of 13 another judge if you don't stop. You understand? 14 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: I didn't see it anywhere in the 16 report. I know he's been evaluated a couple times now. 17 But any ongoing programming? Not at Sauk. 18 MR. BUGNI: No, Your Honor. 19 20 THE COURT: All right. I am prepared to render 21 sentence. AGENT: Your Honor, I apologize for 22 interrupting. But just for the record, I believe that 23 the total offense level with acceptance and the two-level 24 25 departure is actually 23, not 20. But the guideline

range is still 46 to 57.

THE COURT: Well, the total offense level -- so the actual -- with removing the last two points would get me to 26. So if I don't give an enhancement with respect to use of computer, that would make the total offense level of 26 and then with the three-level reduction it would be 23.

AGENT: Yes, I believe so.

THE COURT: I appreciate your correcting that.

That doesn't change -- the guideline imprisonment range I had right, I just had not -- I had twice reduced the three-level adjustment. All right. So it remains 46 to 57 months.

The defendant grew up in a intact household and reported having a happy childhood, although it was plainly an isolated one, punctuated by limited interactions with his father who struggled with alcoholism and his mother who had responsibility for supporting the household through in-home care, which meant that she was away.

As the defendant reports, his school years were also marked by bullying, and what can be as bad, indifference by his classmates. As a result, the defendant spent most of his time whether by choice or not alone. While he enjoyed outdoor activities with his family, he was placed

in special education activities at a early age, which also contributed to his isolation, and continued throughout high school, although he had apparently a wonderful person assisting him in programming in high school.

Despite his learning disabilities, teachers expressed optimism that the defendant would lead a successful life, although he was described by those who knew him as isolated and quiet.

As a child, the defendant admitted to being involved 11 in several incidents of inappropriate and nonconsensual sexual contact. The records confirm incidents of sexually inappropriate behavior in school. The defendant was able to gain a small group of friends in high school, although he continued to spend most of his time away from others. He admitted to viewing pornography for several hours after school each day as a teenager, and despite this, did graduate from high school, in part due to the assistance that he received but also due to his own ability.

He continued living with his parents after high school. His brother, his brother's girlfriend, and his niece also resided in the home.

The defendant obtained his first job working at a car detailing shop. Unfortunately he lost that job due

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

to chronic physical health issues that inhibited his ability to work. His physical condition worsened with age, requiring medical treatment. And his mental health has also deteriorated, apparently as a result of his growing physical disabilities.

The defendant was placed on medication and has financially supported through disability.

As for the instant offense, undercover officers investigating the distribution of child pornography on a messaging and chat room application called Kik. addition to receiving, the defendant also distributed at least eight images of child pornography on Kik. Additionally, he communicated with undercover law enforcement officers in chat rooms where he explicitly disclosed sexually assaulting a 10-year-old girl. of that was clearly not true; however, the defendant described at least some conduct that could have been The defendant later stated to law enforcement that the conduct he described was something he made up merely to engage in chat and it's clear that at least some the conduct was exactly that.

On August 20, 2015, law enforcement executed a search warrant at the defendant's residence and seized 24 several items of technology that the defendant used to access pornography, child pornography. The defendant

admitted to both posting and viewing child pornography in chat rooms, but denied any history of sexual contact with juveniles once he himself became a juvenile. During the investigation, a 10-year-old girl also reported to law enforcement that the defendant touched her vagina while she was sleeping. Her parents insist the assault was a dream. This is an oddly specific dream and at least suggested an inappropriate relationship existed between the two, something that would also seem confirmed by the parents placing a lock on her bedroom door the following day.

The defendant agreed to a polygraph examination in which he was found to be deceptive in his responses to having sexual contact with minors, although it is difficult to assess whether the defendant's processing impairments may have contributed to that result.

Today the defendant is a 30-year-old man. He has been incarcerated for this offense since August 20th of 2015. It's a very long time to be in a jail. Following the defendant's arrest, he underwent psychological evaluations at the request of defense counsel and by the Court. Some of the information contained is conflicting; nonetheless, it was determined that while the defendant suffers from depression and limited cognitive functioning, he was competent to stand trial as well as

capable of understanding the legal proceedings and assisting in his defense.

The defendant's health problems and mental health challenges appear to be effectively managed in a custodial setting. The records reflect that he has been able to function appropriately in the general inmate population, which is not to minimize the challenges that he will have incarcerated in a prison setting.

Even if this Court were to ignore the alleged hands-on report of sexual contact with the minor, his conduct in this offense would still be disturbing. The defendant knew what he was doing and used specific search terms to seek child pornography images. He posted images as well as used nonpornographic images of a known female child as bait. He knowingly joined a chat group that shared child pornography images and he engaged in egregious chats about sexually exploiting minors.

Finally, the defendant openly chatted about and discussed images that depicted the abuse of children ranging from infants to the age of ten.

The defendant is requesting a sentence that will allow him to immediately return to the community in a group home setting for the aged and disabled. Even if appropriate, such a placement creates its own logistical difficulties given his sex offender status. A specific

suitable group home has not yet been identified. It is undetermined if a group home will house him as a sex offender with all the vulnerable population of aging or the disabled involved. There no doubt is a setting that we could find, but there are third-party risks that will be attendant and computer monitoring will be difficult, as anyone who had a computer would be a potential source for the defendant to access or to manipulate others to access images.

While his family remains supportive, they have in 11 the past enabled and attempted to downplay his conduct and that too is a concern. Supervision will certainly provide the community protection, but the proper setting and the proper treatment is part of the challenge that the defendant will face.

While the defendant's mental and physical conditions are extraordinary and place him, in the Court's view, outside the heart line of a typical child pornography case, under Sections 5H1.3, 1.4 and 5K2.0, it could also be argued that his cognitive limitations increase the risk he presents to the community. I do think on balance, and the experts seem to agree, that he presents a low risk in that regard, but that's not to say that past behaviors, particularly voyeurism and inappropriate touching and his viewing of pornography for several hours

a day as a teenager and the escalating conduct that brings him before me does not raise a continued concern.

Taking into consideration the nature of the offense, as well as the defendant's personal history and characteristics, I am persuaded that a custodial sentence of 36 months is reasonable and no greater than necessary to hold the defendant accountable, protect the community, provide the defendant the opportunity for rehabilitative programs, and achieve parity with the sentences of similarly situated offenders.

As to Count 1 of the Information, it is adjudged that the defendant is committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 36 months. I recommend that the defendant receive mental health treatment, educational/vocational training, and most importantly sex offender treatment and that the Bureau make a priority his placement in an appropriate facility, both for that purpose and in recognition of his own vulnerabilities.

I also recommend that he be afforded pre-release placement in a residential reentry center with work release privileges. This term of supervised release must follow -- supervised release must be at least five years under statute based on the nature of the offense here.

And the defendant's pattern of sexual behaviors began at an early age, the term of imprisonment is to be followed

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

by a 15-year supervised -- 15-year term of supervised release.

In light of the nature of the offense and defendant's personal history, I adopt the conditions through 4, 7 through 9, 11 through 23, noting that neither party raised objections to those proposals. Given the history, I have no difficulty finding them consistent with the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984. Specifically the imposed conditions are warranted based on all of the justifications set forth in the presentence report, his offense of conviction, and his permanent history requiring registration as a sex offender, and abiding by travel and employment restrictions to other states will be crucial to his monitoring, as will the other rules requiring his supervision, compliance with law, and notifying third parties of any risk that his personal history may pose. He also has a documented history of mental health and cognitive issues and will likely benefit from treatment.

Finally, as has been noted by the probation office as well as by the defense, there is a possibility that a supervising officer can find resources for the defendant that he has not been able to do on his own or through his family that may well benefit him in the longer term.

I am inclined to add a third condition because I

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

want to be sure that at some point there is a proper pre-release placement or a proper placement here. So if the Bureau of Prisons is unable to place the defendant a pre-release placement, I do recommend as Special Condition No. 24 that the defendant spend -- and I adopt the first -- and order that he spend the first 180 days in a residential re-entry center as approved by the supervising U.S. probation officer. His absences from the center for employment purposes, mental health counseling and treatment, and for other passes consistent with program rules should be allowed. He is to pay his own medical expenses, if any, and is to pay 25 percent of his gross income toward the daily cost of residence and may be discharged early from the facility upon approval of both the facility administrator, supervising U.S. probation officer. I believe under the requirements I will simply enter that as an additional condition.

I want to ensure that the defendant has a transition into the community that is more structured than would be otherwise, but I will consult with the probation office as to whether that condition should be stated or if I should leave it to the Bureau of Prisons in the first instance.

With that, I note that there is some question as to whether I should go through each individual condition

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

23

24

25

expressly as well as provide specific justification for those conditions and I would defer to the defense as whether you want to waive that reading and individual justification or if you want me to go through them individually.

MR. BUGNI: Your Honor, we will waive that. I've gone over that with Mr. Shilts and his

THE COURT: Thank you. If, when the defendant is released back into the community, either the defendant or his family or the supervising probation officer believe that any of the conditions no longer are appropriate, I am certainly willing to consider a revision and any may -- well, the defendant or the probation officer may petition this court for a revision, and if they do so jointly, it is likely I will grant it. Regardless, I will consider it.

The instant offense is not drug related and the defendant has no history of drug use, which is to his credit. Therefore, the requirement for drug testing 20 under Sec. 3583(d) of Title 18 is waived. The defendant is adjudged to pay a \$100 criminal assessment penalty to the Clerk of Court for the Western District of Wisconsin immediately following sentencing. And as for other mandatory restitution, he is to pay in the amount to the Clerk of Court for the Western District of

3

5

6

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Wisconsin pursuant to Sec. 3664(d)(5) of Title 18. disbursements will go to Deborah A. Bianco, who represents a Pia, Ava and/or Mya in Bellevue, Washington, at the address indicated in the presentence report. The defendant does not have the economic resources to allow himself to make full payment of restitution -- actually I think the address might be in the specific submission the victim. So regardless, the full address is adopted. I do find he lacks the economic means to pay any -- 10 well, to pay full restitution in the foreseeable future and therefore under Sec. 3664(f)(3)(B) of Title 18 he is to begin making nominal payments of a minimum of \$50 each month beginning within 30 days of his release from imprisonment. The defendant shall notify the Court and the United States Attorney General of any material change in his economic circumstances that might affect his ability to pay restitution. He does not have the ability to pay any further fine under Sec. 5E1.2(c) without impairing his ability to support himself upon release and so I impose no additional fine.

The offense of conviction requires that the defendant pay a \$5,000 assessment under the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act 2015 unless he is indigent. The defendant has been appointed counsel and does not have the financial resources to pay his assessment and

therefore I make that finding and deem the assessment waived.

Final order of forfeiture is granted for the property seized from the defendant as reflected in the Court's earlier forfeiture order by statute. Finally, the U.S. Probation Office is to notify local law enforcement agencies and the State Attorney General of the defendant's release to the community.

I believe there are no counts to dismiss. So Mr. Shilts, my final obligation is to advise you that you have a right to appeal my sentence. You have very capable counsel who will assist you in filing a notice if you and he decide that that's appropriate. But you only have 14 days to do so, so you should discuss that with him sooner rather than later and I am confident he will talk that over with you as well.

Anything more for the government at this time?

MS. ALTMAN: Yes, Your Honor. He did plead to an Information, so I believe I do need to move to dismiss the first underlying Indictment.

THE COURT: All right. To the extent required, then I dismiss the underlying Indictment.

Anything more for the defense?

MR. BUGNI: Nothing, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Shilts, you're going

to spend an additional time in a federal prison. I will make what efforts I can to see that that is a placement where you can be part of a program that will further evaluate and try to assist you in understanding this compulsion that you have to look at these pictures and ways to stop it -- for you to stop it, which is what ultimately has to happen. You will spend time in a residential re-entry center, either through the Bureau of Prisons or by direction of the probation office, and hopefully during that period you can find structure that makes sense for you and puts you in the best position to succeed going forward in your life.

You have a lot of wonderful qualities. Apparently your last employer would welcome you back. I hope you find a path that gives meaning to the rest of your life and you can find a way to move away from watching images that are only ensuring that more small children are abused and that you no longer become a source of demand for that.

With that, we are adjourned.

(Proceedings concluded at 4:18 p.m.)

I, LYNETTE SWENSON, Certified Realtime and Merit Reporter in and for the State of Wisconsin, certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate record of the proceedings held on the 27th day of April 2017 before the Honorable William M. Conley, District Judge for the Western District of Wisconsin, in my presence and reduced to writing in accordance with my stenographic notes made at said time and place. Dated this 16th day of May 2017. /s/____ Lynette Swenson, RMR, CRR, CRC Federal Court Reporter